

REMARKS

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 7 and 8 have been amended. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 and 8 are pending and under consideration.

No new matter is being presented, and approval of the amended and new claims is respectfully requested.

REQUEST FOR WITHDRAWAL OF FINALITY AND REASONS FOR ENTRY

Applicant requests withdrawal of the finality of this Office Action and entry of this Rule 116 Response and Request for Reconsideration because the Examiner has newly rejected the claims under 35 U.S.C. §101, which constitutes new grounds of rejection, which were not necessitated by the claim amendments. The amendments to claims 7 and 8 are merely to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101. The amendments were not earlier presented because the Applicant believed in good faith, and maintain, that the claims satisfied the statutory requirements under 35 U.S.C. §101. The amendments do not entail any further search by the Examiner since no new features are being added or no new issues are being raised.

Further, the Examiner has introduced a new reference (Li et al.) to reject the pending claims. Applicant should be afforded an opportunity to respond to this newly-cited reference.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101

On pages 3-6, item 4, of the Action, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner states that the language of the claims raises a question as to whether the claims are directed to merely an abstract idea, since the claims recite a computer program that does not include the computer-readable medium needed to realize the functionality of the computer program.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's characterization of the claims. For example, independent claims 1 and 4 are directed to a Web server for transmitting a Web page. Therefore, it is clear that the computer program functions are embodied on a tangible medium (i.e., a Web server).

Regarding the rejections of independent claims 7 and 8, these claims are directed to "A computer program product for use in a computer", which satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §101, since the computer program product is a tangible medium storing a program. However, independent claims 7 and 8 are further amended to recite "A computer-readable storage

medium storing a program for use in a computer”, to further satisfy the statutory requirements.

The Examiner further states, regarding the independent claims, that the method merely manipulates data, and does not produce a concrete, useful and tangible result. However, the independent claims clearly recite generating a Web page, transmitting the Web page to a terminal of a user, regenerating the Web page and retransmitting a Web page to the terminal device of an administrator. Generating the Web pages and transmitting and retransmitting the Web pages to terminals clearly constitute a concrete, useful and tangible result.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101 are overcome and should be withdrawn.

REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 1, 2 AND 8 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY BODIN ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,604,106 B1) IN VIEW OF LI ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,591,266)

The rejections of claims 1, 2 and 8 are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The Examiner acknowledges that Bodin does not teach the features of independent claim 1, added in the previous Amendment, and thus Li et al. (hereinafter “Li”) is cited as disclosing these features. Specifically, the Examiner states that Li discloses a Web page generation portion, a Web page transmission portion, a content information extraction portion, a Web page regeneration portion and a regenerated Web page transmission portion, as recited in independent claim 1, for example.

However, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's understanding of Li. Li discusses a system for updating Web pages stored in cache based on modifications to data stored in a database. When a user makes a request for a dynamically created Web page, the Web server 38 converts the request into a new request 46, including the URL and other parameters that can be understood by the application server 40. Then, the application server 40 puts together the dynamically created Web page 48 in HTML. (See Li, column 3, lines 37-49).

The Examiner suggests that Li reads on a Web page regenerating a Web page in accordance with the extracted contents information, as recited in independent claims 1 and 8, by discussing converting the request into a new request which includes the URL and other parameters that can be understood by the server. However, merely converting a request into a new request does not constitute regenerating a Web page, as recited in independent claims 1 and 8.

Li further discusses that a typical request for a dynamic Web page will pass through a

Web server 38, application server 40, and DBMS 26, and then eventually the created Web page will be transmitted back to the end user 28. (See Li, column 4, lines 45-50).

The Examiner suggests that this feature of Li reads on a regenerated Web page transmission portion transmitting the Web page regenerated by the Web page regeneration portion to a terminal device of the administrator who designated the Web page identifying information for the Web page. However, as discussed above, Li does not discuss any “regeneration” at all and, thus, does not discuss transmission of a regenerated Web page. Further, the Web page in Li is merely transmitted to the end user (as stated by the Examiner), and is never transmitted to the terminal device of the administrator who designated the Web page identifying information for the Web page, as recited in independent claims 1 and 8.

In contrast, according to embodiments of the present invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 8, a Web page that was sent to a specific user is easily reproduced. In addition, even if a current Web page partly or entirely differs from the Web page that was sent to a specific user, it is possible to truly reproduce the Web page as viewed by the specific user.

Consequently, an administrator can solve the problems indicated in the “Description of the Prior Art” of the present specification. More specifically, for example, an administrator of the Web server may receive a question about a method for dealing with a failure that is reported to the Web server. A report of the failure may include, for example, that there was no document found containing the entered keyword or that an error message was displayed even though a keyword was inputted correctly. However, in most cases, the user does not remember correctly the Web page that was displayed by the terminal device. Therefore, the administrator can obtain only ambiguous information about the failure, so it is difficult to properly answer the question of the user.

Further, independent claim 1, for example, recites making a storage portion store contents information indicating contents of a Web page determined in accordance with parameters designated by a user, *in connection with Web page identifying information for the Web page and user identifying information for the user*. (Emphasis added). Independent claim 8 recites similar features.

The Examiner has not provided a reference that teaches or even suggests these features.

Bodin et al. (hereinafter “Bodin”) discloses merely a server-side mechanism that accepts a client request to serve contents, and returns a response. (Column 3, lines 54-57). The cited portion of Bodin merely discloses that the primary objective of Bodin is to optimize storage of the server contents, and dynamically serve such content in response to the client request. (Column

1, lines 64-66).

In fact, the Examiner notes, on pages 5-7 of the previous Office Action, mailed January 11, 2006, that Bodin fails to disclose determining the entire or part of contents of a Web page in accordance with a parameter designated by the user, or a Web page regeneration portion for generating a Web page designated by an administrator

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the prior art fails to teach or even suggest the features of independent claims 1 and 8 described above. Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and, thus, it is further submitted that claims 1 and 2 patentably distinguish over the prior art.

REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 4, 5 AND 7 FOR OBVIOUSNESS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER BODIN IN VIEW OF CARLSON (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,697,849)

The rejections of claims 4, 5 and 7 are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Independent claims 4 and 7 recite similar features to independent claim 1, described above. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 4 and 7 patentably distinguish over the cited art for at least the reasons provided above. Further, Carlson is merely cited as disclosing a business logic unit determining the entire or a part of contents of a Web page in accordance with a parameter designated by a user and, thus, does not cure the deficiencies of Bodin and Li.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 4 and 7 patentably distinguish over the prior art. Claim 5 depends from claim 4 and inherits the patentability thereof. Thus, it is further submitted that claim 5 patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. Further, all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Serial No. 10/720,060

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: October 26, 2006

By: Michael P. Stanley
Michael P. Stanley
Registration No. 58,523

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501